## Remarks/Arguments

This communication is in response to the office action mailed 01/27/2004 (paper 20).

Claims 1-11, 15, 17-25, and 28-29 are pending in this application. Claims 16, 26 and 27 are cancelled in this response.

**Regarding Claim 20:**

The Examiner fails to provide a basis for the rejection of claim 20. The Applicants request that the Examiner provide a basis per 37 CFR 1.104(c) or allow claim 20. Further, the Applicants note that if a new basis for the rejection of claim 20 is provided, doing so would be improper in a final office action per MPEP 706.07(a).

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101 and 35 USC § 102**

Claims 16, 26 and 27, rejected under 35 USC § 101 and 35 USC § 102, have been cancelled.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

In the office action of 01/27/2004 the Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9-11, 15, 17-19, 21-25, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecht (5,535,322) in view of Aleia et al. (5,991,733) and Bosco et al. (5,191,522). The Applicants traverse these rejections.

**Regarding Claim 1:**

Claim 1 recites,

*1. (Original) An integrated system for the real time administration of an organization, said system comprising:*
*a plurality of networked computers;*
*at least one of said computers comprising an activity processor;*
*at least one of said computers comprising an activity scheduler;*
*at least one file server operatively connected to said networked computers;*

*means for real time performance of a plurality of functions relevant to administration of said organization.*
*manual entry means for entering data relative to any of said functions;*
*data receiving and verifying means for receiving and verifying data from any of said networked computers, against said manual entry means and said at least one predetermined standard;*
*means responsive to said entered data and received data for real time updating of said data across said network of computers relative to any of said functions when desired;*
*data storage means for storing data;*
*display means for displaying any of said data;*
*means for predefining via said activity scheduler relative to said entered data that selected first types of entered data are to be processed by said activity processor in real time and that selected second types of said entered data are to be queued for processing at another time;*
*menu driven means for defining a product in response to menu selections made by a user; and*
*menu driven means for receiving a request into said network of computers by displaying via said display means screens that vary depending upon said request.*

It is the Applicants' position that the cited art does not teach "*data receiving and verifying means for receiving and verifying data from any of said networked computers, against said manual entry means and said at least one predetermined standard,*" as recited in claim 1. With regard to this claim element, the Examiner points out that Hecht teaches "sending data to an external system from workstations for an entity check and an integrity check... wherein a[n entity] check includes checking for address changes," (Current OA, paragraph 11(A)(g)). However, the Applicants are unable to find any teaching within the cited text regarding verifying "*against said manual entry means and said at least one predetermined standard*" as recited in claim 1. For example, the entity check taught in Hecht appears to be a check on the identity of a tax paying entity as determined by an optical character reader that is specifically configured to avoid having to use "*manual entry means*" to process Internal Revenue Service tax filings. Thus, the entity check of Hecht, rather then "*verifying ... against said manual entry means*" as

recited in claim 1, appears to teach away from manual entry means in favor of optical character recognition. Likewise, the integrity assertion taught on col. 9 line 1 of Hecht appears to be a check of mathematical integrity rather than "*verifying ... against said manual entry means*" as recited in claim 1. The Applicants are unable to find any teaching within Hecht of "*verifying ... against said manual entry means and said at least one predetermined standard*" and, therefore, requests that the Examiner specifically point out such teaching, or allow claim 1.

Further, it is the Applicants' position that the cited art does not teach

> *means for predefining via said activity scheduler relative to said entered data that selected first types of entered data are to be processed by said activity processor in real time and that selected second types of said entered data are to be queued for processing at another time*"

as recited in claim 1. Regarding this element of claim 1, the Examiner concedes that Hecht fails to expressly disclose these claim limitations but cites Aleia as teaching equivalent subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states

> Aleia discloses a file processor means for storing and managing predetermined collections of data ... wherein managing collector queues processing includes an on-line ability to prioritize an account for immediate attention by a collector or manager (reads on "in real time")... (Current OA, page 9).

The Applicants believe that it is improper to read "for immediate attention by a collector or manager" as teaching "real time" processing. For example, the "collector" of Aleia is a separate entity such as a collection agency, thus any immediacy implied in Aleia would involve transferring a bad debt to a collection agency for collection. This is a process that could easily take days. In contrast, the "*real time processing*" of the invention "reduces, and in some cases eliminates, the necessity for an operator to wait," (Application as filed page 13 lines 11-20). Further, on page 13 of the specification as

filed "real time" processing is differentiated from functions that are not performed while an operator waits, e.g. functions that take "a few minutes." Thus, the use of "*real time*" within claim 1, and as characterized in the specification, is substantially different from the characterization of real time suggested by the Examiner. Transferring a bad debt to a collection agency for collection (a long term process) does not teach real time processing as used within the specification. It is, therefore, the Applicants' position that Aleia does not teach "*selected first types of entered data are to be processed by said activity processor in real time*" and that claim 1 should be allowed.

Further, the processing recited in claim 1 is performed "*by said activity processor*" while the debt collection taught in Aleia is performed by human account managers or collection agencies. The Applicants are unable to find teaching within the cited art of different types of entered data being selected for processing in real time or at another time by an activity processor. The Applicants request that the Examiner specifically point out such teaching or allow claim1.

**Regarding Claims 2-7:**

The Applicants believe that claims 2-7 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed herein with regard to claim 1.

**Regarding Claim 9:**

Claim 9 recites,

9. (Original) An integrated sy*stem for the real time administration of an organization, said system comprising:*
*a plurality of networked computers;*
*at least one of said computers comprising an activity processor;*
*at least one of said personal computers comprising an activity scheduler;*
*at least one file server operatively connected to said network;*
*means for real time performance of a plurality of predetermined functions;*
*manual entry means for entering data relative to any of said functions;*

*data receiving and verifying means for receiving, verifying and updating data from any of said computers, said manual entry means and said at least one file server against at least one predetermined standard;*
*means responsive to said entered data and received data for real time updating data relative to any of said functions when desired;*
*data file means for storing data;*
*display means for displaying any of said data;*
*means for predefining via said activity scheduler that selected first types of entered data are to be processed by said activity processor in real time and that selected second types of entered data are to be queued for processing at another time;*
*display means for displaying any of said data;*
*menu driven means for defining a product in response to menu selections made by a user;*
*menu driven mean for receiving an application for said product into said network by displaying, via said display means, screens that vary depending upon said selected product;*
*means for providing a retrievable audit history of every function processed by said system, said audit history at least retrievable by date, time and transaction type;*
*means for defining a hierarchy of sales agents comprising who each sales agent reports to and who reports to each sales agent, said means selectively defining thereby a corresponding hierarchy for each product;*
*means for real time calculation of commissions for sales agents based on where an agent is in said hierarchy;*
*means for the real time reversal of any transaction;*
*means for changing a sales agent's commission when a relevant transaction is reversed;*
*means for calculating commission tax information; and means for printing a commission tax form.*

The Applicants' arguments made above with respect to claim 1 apply as well to claim 9, and are incorporated herein by reference. The Applicants, therefore, believe that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Further, regarding the claim element "*means for providing a retrievable audit history of every function processed by said system, said audit history at least retrievable by date, time and transaction type*," the Examiner states "[i]t would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to retrieve an audit information stored in the system taught collectively

by Hecht, Aleia, and Bosco...," (Current OA, page 13.) However, the Applicants respectfully point out that "*means for providing a retrievable audit history of every function processed*" is substantially different than the retrieval of audit information suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner supplies no support for the assumption that it is obvious that the retrievable audit history be "*of every function processed,*" as recited in claim 9, rather than for example, merely a login log.

Further, regarding the claim element "*means for defining a hierarchy of sales agents comprising who each sales agent reports to and who reports to each sales agent, said means selectively defining thereby a corresponding hierarchy for each product,*" the Examiner states "Bosco suggests that representatives (e.g., agents) are assigned to cases based on their rank or experience levels (col. 14 lines 24-33 of Bosco)," (Current OA, page 13). In fact, the cited text appears to merely imply that representatives may be "differentiated by rank." It is the Applicants' position that a rank does not necessarily teach "a hierarchy of sales agents" as recited in claim 9. In addition, the second part of this claim element recites "*said means selectively defining thereby a corresponding hierarchy for each product.*" The Applicants are unable to find any aspect of the cited art that could be considered to teach this limitation and it does not seem to be addressed in the current office action. The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner particularly point out such a teaching, or allow claim 9.

Further, the Examiner does not appear to address the claim element "*means for the real time reversal of any transaction*" in the current office action. The Examiner states "[t]he remainder of system claim 9 repeats the same limitations of system claim 1, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1, and incorporated

herein." However, the Applicants respectfully point out that the above limitation is not included in claim 1 and has not been addressed by the Examiner's comments. The Applicants, therefore request that the Examiner specifically point out teaching of this limitation within the cited prior art, or allow claim 9.

Further, the Examiner does not appear to address the claim element "*means for changing a sales agent's commission when a relevant transaction is reversed*," in the current office action. The Examiner states "[t]he remainder of system claim 9 repeats the same limitations of system claim 1, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1, and incorporated herein." However, the Applicants respectfully point out that the above limitation is not included in claim 1 and has not been addressed by the Examiner's comments. The Applicants, therefore request that the Examiner specifically point out teaching of this limitation within the cited prior art, or allow claim 9.

**Regarding claim 10:**

Claim 10 recites,

*10. (Previously Presented) A method of real time administration of an organization using a plurality of networked computers comprising:*
*simultaneously monitoring the input of data on discrete computers within said plurality of networked computers;*
*comparing said data input to existing entries on said plurality of networked computers;*
*determining if said data input matches preexisting data on said networked computers;*
*updating said preexisting data throughout said network;*
*entering menu driven parameters to define a new product on said plurality of networked computers;*
*entering optional parameters for delayed updating of said data; and*
*prioritizing said updating of said data based on said optional parameters.*

Regarding Claim 10 the Examiner states "[c]laims 10, 11, and 25 differ from claim 1 by reciting 'entering optional parameters for delayed updating of said data' and

'prioritizing said updating of said data based on said optional parameters," (Current OA, page 14). The Applicants strongly traverse this statement and point out that the claim element "*simultaneously monitoring the input of data on discrete computers within said plurality of networked computers*" is recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants do not believe that there is a limitation of similar scope in claim 1. For example, claim 1 does not recite "*simultaneously monitoring the input data on discrete computers.*" Further, the claim element "*comparing said data input to existing entries on said plurality of networked computers*" is recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants do not believe that there is a limitation of similar scope in claim 1. Further, the claim element "*determining if said data input matches preexisting data on said networked computers*" is recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants do not believe that there is a limitation of similar scope in claim 1. For example, claim 1 does not recite "*determining if said data input matches preexisting data.*" Further, the claim element "*updating said preexisting data throughout said network*" is recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants do not believe that there is a limitation of similar scope in claim 1. For example, claim 1 does not recite "*updating said preexisting data.*" Further, the claim element "*entering menu driven parameters to define a new product on said plurality of networked computers*" is recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants do not believe that there is a limitation of similar scope in claim 1. For example, claim 1 does not recite "*entering menu driven parameters to define a new product.*" Thus, contrary to the Examiner's statement, there are at least five additional claim elements that are recited in claim 10 but not claim 1. The Applicants request that the Examiner

specifically point out teaching within the cited art of all of the limitations recited in claim 10 or allow claim 10.

Further regarding Claim 10, the Examiner discusses teachings within Aleia that are purported to relate to prioritizing, but does not discuss either "*delayed updating of said data*" or "*prioritizing said updating*," as recited in claim 10. Those sections of Aleia that the Examiner cites appear to refer to prioritizing of collection accounts – not to updating data that is "*preexisting*" "*throughout said network*," as recited in claim 10. The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner more specifically point out teachings within the cited art that anticipate all the limitations of claim 10, or allow claim 10.

**Regarding Claim 11:**

Claim 11 recites,

*11. (Previously Presented) A network computer-based method of administering an organization comprising:*
*entering discrete product definitions using questions in a menu-based architecture;*
*defining a new product in response to said definitions;*
*monitoring user input on computers of a computer network;*
*comparing said user input against existing data entries stored in said computer network;*
*prioritizing updating of said existing data entries; and*
*updating said existing data entries on said computer network system to reflect said user input, using said prioritization.*

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner discusses teachings within Aleia that are purported to relate to prioritizing, but does not discuss either "*delayed updating of said existing data entries*" or "*using said prioritizing*," as recited in claim 11. Those sections of Aleia that the Examiner cites appear to refer to prioritizing of collection accounts – not to "*delayed updating*" of "*existing*" data as recited in claim 11. The Applicants,

therefore, request that the Examiner more specifically point out teachings within the cited art that anticipate all the limitations of claim 11, or allow claim 11.

**Regarding Claim 25:**

The arguments made above with regard to claims 1, 10, and 11 also apply to claim 25.

**Regarding Claim 15:**

The arguments made above with regard to claim 11 also apply to claim 15.

**Regarding Claims 17-19, 21-22 and 29:**

The arguments made above with regard to claims 1, 10, and 11 also apply to claims 17-19, 21-23 and 29.

**Regarding Claim 24:**

The arguments made above with regard to claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 also apply to claim 24.

**Regarding Claim 28:**

The Examiner states "[c]laim 28 repeats the same limitations as claim 20, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given for claim 20, and incorporated herein. However, the Applicants are unable to identify the reasons referred to by the Examiner. Neither a basis for the rejection of claim 20 nor supporting arguments appear to be included in the current office action (paper 20). The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner more specifically point out teachings within the cited art, or allow claim 28.

**Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luchs et al (4,831,526) in view of Hecht (5,535,322).**

**Regarding claim 8:**

Claim 8 recites,

*8. (Original) An improved method of configuring a computer based network system to the real time requirements of an organization, said method comprising the steps of:*

*generating a series of displayed questions to the user for defining at least minimum characteristics of a product and which form letters to be used for particular occasions, for each of said products to be defined;*

*receiving corresponding answers to said questions into said computer network and using said answers to define said products;*

*electronically receiving and converting to data an application for said product into said network via display menu screens that vary depending upon said product that is desired and the menu selections made by said user;*

*deeming at least one of said computers an activity scheduler and deeming at least one of the said computers an activity processor; and*

*processing said data and said answers in real time via the operations of said activity scheduler and said activity processor.*

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner states "on-line communication is considered to be a form of 'real-time'," (Current OA, page18). The Applicants traverse this statement. Mere on-line communication does not necessarily imply real time processing "*via operation of said activity scheduler and said activity processor*," as recited in claim 8.

Further, even if, for the sake of argument, the menus and submenus taught on col. 14 line 58 to col. 15 line 15 in Luchs were considered real time processing responsive to data entry, this type of response is not "*via operation of said activity scheduler and said activity processor*," as recited in claim 8. It is therefore, the Applicants' belief that the cited art does not teach all the limitations of claim 8. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 8, or particularly point out prior art teachings of all the limitations of the claim.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner have questions, the Applicants' undersigned representative may be reached at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald Peters et al.

Date: May 27, 2005

Steven M. Colby, Reg. No. 50,250
Carr & Ferrell *LLP*
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone (650) 812-3400
Fax (650) 812-3444